



ff 10
Response
10/11/02
Atty
RECEIVED

Docket No.
90065.001020/17732.8011.00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Martin E. Kordesch, et al.) Examiner:
Serial No. : 09/682,151) Chris C. Chu
Filed : 27 July 2001)
For : CONTACT METHOD FOR THIN SILICON) Art Unit:
CARBIDE EPITAXIAL LAYER AND) 2815
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES FORMED BY)
THOSE METHODS)
)

OCT - 9 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 280

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed July 1, 2002 in connection with the above-referenced patent application, Applicants hereby submit the following remarks.

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks. The rejection is *prima facie* illegal, erroneous and not supported by the references of record.

The rejection is made under 35 USC Section 102 (b). A 102(b) reference must show each and every element of the claims. Claim 9 calls for compound semiconductor materials. The reference, US 5396087, fails to show or suggest any compound semiconductor materials.

In commenting on the rejection of claim 10, the action acknowledges that the reference "does not limit" its alleged compound semiconductor material to any particular or specific material. That is true but it is an understatement of the paucity of disclosure in the reference. In fact, the reference fails to show or suggest any compound semiconductor material.

The rejection erroneously reasons that because there is no disclosure of any compound semiconductor material, that it encompasses all compound semiconductor materials.